



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS

Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Sozialwissenschaften, Zeitschrift des Forschungsinstituts für Sozialwissenschaften in Köln. Herausgegeben von den Direktoren des Instituts, Christian Eckert, Hugo Lindemann, Max Scheler, Leopold von Wiese. 1. Jahrgang, Heft 1. Duncker und Humblot, München, Leipzig. 1. Jahrgang (4 Hefte) M. 40, Einzelhefte M. 12. Two of the four numbers are to be devoted exclusively to general sociology, the other two will represent the subjects which Dr. Henderson preferred to indicate by the title social technology.

The appearance of this new journal is surprising for more than one reason. In the first place American scholars had been led to believe that many German scientific publications would be compelled to suspend if emergency aid of some sort did not keep them alive. The founding of a new journal in Germany seems to impeach the correctness of these representations. In the second place, the appearance of a new German journal of sociology affords unexpected evidence that the subject has obtained more academic recognition in Germany than American sociologists have suspected.

There are signs in the initial number before us that the Cologne journal is to be edited from the standpoint of Simmel's conception of sociology. Far be it from the present writer to desire that Simmel should be forgotten or neglected. The importance of the kind of fundamental analysis of group forms which he developed has not yet attained to the ratio of recognition which it deserves. Investigation of the form aspects of social groups, as we argued more than once in both conversations and correspondence with Simmel, can be bad only when it is regarded as self-sufficient. Considered as an introductory procedure in sociology, implying corresponding analysis of functional and control aspects of group processes and problems, the Simmel method is both foundation-laying in itself and it is provocative of similarly penetrating investigation of the movement aspects of groups, and of the personal values involved in arriving at norms for programs of conscious group action.

Speaking from the viewpoint of the sociological profession in the United States, however, whether this new journalistic enterprise, and

sociological scholarship in general in Germany, is to exhibit a predominance of one or another *Richtung*, is a matter of relative indifference. Under the impulse of what methodological presuppositions the Germans enlist in winning for sociology a position of parity with the older social sciences is likely in the long run to have far less importance for us than the fact that they are actually enlisting. In the end objectivity, not antecedent hypothesis, will decide whether functions remain to be performed in filling out social science as a whole, which are indicated as the field of action for researchers into neglected aspects of human relations. This decision, not the preferences of a priori reasoners, will at last settle the terms of the methodological mandate under which sociologists will function, if they maintain themselves as necessary functioners. As to this we have no doubts. It merely remains to be seen how long it will take for the sociological demonstration to become convincing.

Perhaps no portion of the present number of the *Zeitschrift* will have greater interest for American professors of sociology than pages 86-90, which contain all that the editors had been able to learn about sociological instruction in German institutions during the year 1920-21. The reports are both gratifying and chastening. They show on the one hand that German sociology is in relatively the same condition of uncertainty about itself which American sociology has been trying to outgrow since 1892. It is certainly stimulating to us to learn that the movement in Germany has gained so much impetus. Our prediction is that the Germans will waste less time in the methodological wilderness than the Americans required. In a relatively short time they will have settled upon their problems, and they will be presently arriving at results which will be the best demonstration that investigation of human experience from the group center of attention yields results which had not been visible from previous orientations.

The leading papers in the current number are: L. von Wiese, "Die Aufgaben einer deutschen Zeitschrift für Soziologie;" Chr. Eckert, "Aufriss und Aufgaben des Forschungs-Instituts für Sozialwissenschaften;" Max Scheler, "Die positivistische Geschichtsphilosophie des Wissens und die Aufgaben einer formalen Gesellschaftslehre."

It would be difficult to imagine a purely scientific incident which would be more gratifying to American sociologists than this new journalistic enterprise. Whether or not it is as universally true as certain economic theorists once taught, that "competition is the life of trade," American sociology is bound to be stimulated by the sort of rivalry which German scholarship will maintain. If it turns out that there are

radical issues between German and American sociologists, so much the better. Threshing out provincialisms on either side will eventually prove to have promoted a stable consensus. We venture to speak for the sociological profession in the United States in wishing for the *Kölner Vierteljahrshefte* a prosperous career, and in assuring the editors that their work will receive due attention on this side of the ocean.

ALBION W. SMALL

The Evolution of Revolution. By H. M. HYNDMAN. New York: Boni & Liveright, 1921. Pp. 406. \$4.00.

My author chose the title at the suggestion of a friend. It was a brilliant conceit, but it contains a promise which the book does not redeem. Nor does it justify the estimate in the publishers' announcement: "We consider this work as practically a history of economic, social, and political change from the immense antiquity of Communism to the present day, the most important contribution that has been made to the literature of this subject in the last fifty years."

The volume will be pleasant reading for many people who do not know when they are reading superficial writing. From the standpoint of critical social science it is neither "history" nor "evolution," in any responsible sense of the terms. A more appropriate title would be, "Some Outstanding Circumstances and Characteristics of Selected Revolutionary Episodes."

This is the sort of book which may well move the professional reader to profitable reflection upon the intellectual revolution now under way. The modern phase of it began in the same period with the industrial and political revolutions of the eighteenth century. It entered upon a novitiate with the coming of Darwinism. The variation of outlook and method so provoked has lately become self-conscious and articulate in the social sciences. With the adolescence of psychology and sociology perception of the thinness and inconclusiveness of nearly everything which has hitherto passed as social "science" is the initial evidence of new birth into the modern thought world. We are just beginning to have respectable inklings of what would be involved in proof of anything social, beyond the mere assembling of occurrences, or aspects of occurrences, in ways which tell more about the caprice of the assemblers than about the essential relations of the details assembled. The technique and resources of the social sciences are at present far below adequacy for solution of any of the difficulties which present themselves to the modern type of social consciousness as worth-while problems.